



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,146	11/25/2003	John C. Gudenkauf	MSFT-2747/303264.01	6324
41505	7590	06/01/2006	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			DEBROW, JAMES J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/721,146	GUDENKAUF ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James J. Debrow	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7, 11-22 and 26-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in responsive to communications: Application filled on 11/25/2003.
2. Claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 are pending in this case. Claims 1, and 16, are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 15 Mar 2006, Applicant amended claims 1 and 16, and canceled claims 8-10 and 23-25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-7, 11-22, and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (Pub. No.: 2001/0032218 A1; Pub. Date: Oct. 18, 2001), in view of Kutay et al. (Pub. No.: 2002/0026461 A1; Pub. Date: Feb. 28, 2002).**

In regard to independent claims 1, and 16, Haung discloses a user interface (*UI*) (section 0037; fig 1) system for generating structured documents. The system contains an editing module (410 in Fig 4) that creates/edits the structured-based font information for the input document. The editing module allows selection of data elements for the input documents and provides an editing environment to alter the attributes for the selected data elements (*receiving a selection of a piece of content, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content*) (section 0067). This module also allows sequence selections of data elements based on the reading order of the input document (*plurality of pieces of content*) (section 0068, lines 6-8). In one embodiment, the system receives a definition file including document type definitions, and displays a metafile document (*layout statement*), which includes a number of *displayable objects*, along with their respective *attributes*. The definition file includes the

structure for the document elements, each corresponding to one of the displayable objects in the metafile/modified metafile (*content-control statement specifying each item to be displayed in the page*) (section 0012). Haung also teaches the presentation of a structured document is usually defined in separate style sheets, which interprets layout for each document element (section 0046; lines 3-9) (*allowing an editor to create the layout statement, the layout statement specifying each item of the content that is to appear in the page*). Style-sheets allow structured documents to be presented in different layouts for different media (*facilitating the editor in editing the layout statement to edit how the content is to appear in the page*). Haung further discloses that other than directly converting into the desired document, the transformation module (414 in Fig 4) can output the edited document as an *intermediate* structured document (*content being an intermediate form*), which can be reloaded for further editing (section 0071). The system also consists of a printer interface (130 in Fig 1B), which is used in outputting the documents produced by the system. The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

Haung does not disclose expressly *receiving a selection of an edit form*.

However, Kutay et al discloses a system for creating/editing source documents (dynamic pages - section 0058, line 4), and presenting the documents to the user in a target format. In one embodiment of the invention, user interface (*UI*) displays a window (*edit form*) containing multiple fields (*controls*), which allow the user to define an

operation that is to be performed on the data (*receiving a selection of a piece of content, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content*) (section 0126, 0128; fig 10D).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the user to input document parameters via an edit form, when selecting an editing operation that is to be performed on a document/page.

The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit of allowing the system to be user friendly, as the user would select the appropriate parameters from the selection provided within the drop-list box.

In regard to dependent claims 2, and 17, Haung discloses a user interface (*UI*) (section 0037; fig 1) system for generating structured documents. The system contains an editing module (410 in Fig 4) that creates/edits the structured-based font information for the input document. The editing module allows selection of data elements for the input documents and provides an editing environment to alter the attributes for the selected data elements (*setting forth editable attributes*) (section 0067). In one embodiment, the system receives a definition file including document type definitions, and displays a metafile document (*layout statement*), which includes a number of displayable objects, along with their respective *attributes*. Each object is a cluster or a group of characters, or words or a *graphical form* (section 0048, lines 12-13). The definition file includes the structure for the document elements, each corresponding to one of the displayable objects in the metafile/modified metafile (*content-control statement*) (section 0012). The definition file is presented graphically (section 0049,

lines 3-4). Haung also teaches the presentation of a structured document is usually defined in separate style sheets, which interprets layout for each document element (section 0046; lines 3-9). Style-sheets allow structured documents to be presented in different layouts for different media. (*setting forth the page based on the content, the edit form, the content-control statement, and the layout statement*)

Haung does not disclose expressly a *user interface (UI) setting for the editable attributes of the edit form, a UI setting forth each item of content, a UI setting forth the content-control statement, a UI setting forth the layout statement, and a UI setting forth the page based on the content, the edit*

However, Kutay et al discloses in one embodiment of the invention, a user interface (*UI*) displays a window (*edit form*) containing multiple fields (parameters), which allow the user to define an operation that is to be performed on the data (section 0126, 0128; fig 10D).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a *UI* when specifying setting for the document that is to be edited and displayed

The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit of allowing the system to be user friendly, as the user would select the appropriate parameters from the selection provided within the drop-list box.

In regard to dependent claims 15, and 30, Haung discloses a user interface (*UI*) (section 0037; fig 1) system for generating structured documents. The system

contains an editing module (410 in Fig 4) that creates/edits the structured-based font information for the input document. The editing module allows selection of data elements for the input documents and provides an editing environment to alter the attributes for the selected data elements (section 0067). This module also allows sequence selections of data elements based on the reading order of the input document (*receiving a selection of a plurality of pieces of content*) (section 0068, lines 6-8). In one embodiment, the system receives a definition file including document type definitions, and displays a metafile document (*layout statement*), which includes a number of *displayable objects*, along with their respective *attributes*. The definition file includes the structure for the document elements, each corresponding to one of the displayable objects in the metafile/modified metafile (*content-control statement specifying each item to be displayed in the page*) (section 0012). Haung also teaches the presentation of a structured document is usually defined in separate style sheets, which interprets layout for each document element (section 0046; lines 3-9) (*allowing an editor to create the layout statement, the layout statement specifying each item of the content that is to appear in the page*). Style-sheets allow structured documents to be presented in different layouts for different media (*facilitating the editor in editing the layout statement to edit how the content is to appear in the page*). Haung further discloses that other than directly converting into the desired document, the transformation module (414 in Fig 4) can output the edited document as an *intermediate structured document* (*content being an intermediate form*), which can be reloaded for further editing (section 0071). The system also consists of a printer interface (130 in Fig 1B), which is used in

outputting the documents produced by the system. The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

Haung does not disclose expressly *receiving a selection of an edit form*.

However, Kutay et al discloses a system for creating/editing source documents (dynamic pages - section 0058, line 4), and presenting the documents to the user in a target format. In one embodiment of the invention, user interface (*UI*) displays a window (*edit form*) containing multiple fields (parameters), which allow the user to define an operation that is to be performed on the data (*receiving a selection of a piece of content, each item specifying a pre-defined portion of the content*) (section 0126, 0128; fig 10D).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to allow the user to input document parameters via an edit form, when selecting an editing operation that is to be performed on a document/page.

The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit of allowing the system to be user friendly, as the user would select the appropriate parameters from the selection provided within the drop-list box.

In regard to dependent claims 13, and 28, Haung discloses in one embodiment, the system receives a definition file including document type definitions, and displays a metafile document, which includes a number of displayable objects, along with their respective *attributes*. Each object is defined by a number (*sequence*) of

attributes or decoration information including but not limited to type, size, color, and *position* of the object such that it can be printed correctly (section 0048, lines 12-19).

The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

Haung doesn't discloses expressly, *the editing process receives a selection of an edit form with a control that specifies a custom attribute for an instance of the control that appears in a page based on the edit form, and facilitates the editor in editing the layout statement to specify a value for the custom attribute.*

However, Kutay et al. discloses in one embodiment of the invention, user interface (*UI*) displays a window (*edit form*) containing multiple fields (parameters), which allow the user to define an operation that is to be performed on the data (section 0126, 0128; fig 10D).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kutay et al. with Haung. The motivation in doing so would have been for the benefit of the user having the capability of customizing the attribute of an instance of the control that appears in a page based on the edit form.

In regard to dependent claims 14, and 29, these claims contain substantially similar subject matter as in claims 1, and 16, and therefore are rejected along the same rationale. Kutay et al. further disclose, if another operation needs to be defined, the user repeats the steps of defining an operation that is to be performed on the data via the

user interface (*UI*) display window (*edit form*) containing multiple fields (parameters), (section 0131, lines 1-5 ; fig 10).

In regard to dependent claims 3, and 18, Haung discloses in one embodiment, the system receives a definition file including document type definitions, and displays a metafile document (*layout statement*), which includes a number of displayable objects, along with their respective *attributes*. Each object is a cluster or a group of characters, or words or a *graphical form* (section 0048, lines 12-13). The definition file includes the structure for the document elements, each corresponding to one of the displayable objects in the metafile/modified metafile (*content-control statement*) (section 0012). The definition file is presented graphically (section 0049, lines 3-4). The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

In regard to dependent claims 4, and 19, Haung discloses a computer and computing device that perform document conversion process (*editing process*) and generate structure documents that may be ultimately represented in a format of markup language such as XML or HTML (section 0036). The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

In regard to dependent claims 5, and 20, Haung discloses a user interface (*UI*) system that use metafile formatted files (*neutral format*) in generating structured documents. The invention may be utilized to convert documents to a markup representation regardless of the exact word processing format (*outputs the edit content in a neutral format not specified to any particular rendering format*) (section 0038). The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

In regard to dependent claims 11, and 26, Haung does not disclose expressly *the editing process receives a selection of an edit form with a control that specifies at least one of a minimum and a maximum number of instances of the control that can appear in a page based on the edit form, and facilitates the editor to select however many instances of the control are desired for the page.*

However, Haung the definition file includes a structure for documents elements, each correspond to one of the displayable objects in the metafile. Some of the documents elements include a number of identifiers, which are numerals or alphabets (section 0012, lines 8-14). Haung further disclose in one embodiment, a counter is configured to count the number of pages in the metafile to be converted. Every time all of the objects in a display are associated with the document elements in a DTD file and saved as a corresponding modified metafile (section 0054, lines 6-11).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that if it was possible to have a mechanism in place to count the number of pages in a metafile, it would also be possible to have a mechanism in place to count the number of objects/elements within a metafile page that are to be displayed.

The motivation for doing so would have been for the benefit of ensuring that the document/page would be able to properly display each element as specified, based on the edit form.

In regard to dependent claims 12, and 27, Haung discloses in one embodiment, the system receives a definition file including document type definitions, and displays a metafile document, which includes a number of displayable objects, along with their respective *attributes*. Each object is defined by a number (*sequence*) of attributes or decoration information including but not limited to type, size, color, and *position* of the object such that it can be printed correctly (section 0048, lines 12-19). The invention is preferably implemented in software, hardware, or a combination of both. Portions of the invention can be embodied as computer readable code on a *computer readable medium* (section 0075).

In regard to dependent claims 6, and 21, Haung does not disclose expressly *the editing process outputs the edit content as an intermediate form of the content based on at least the edit form, the content-control statement, and the layout statement.*

However, Haung discloses that other than directly converting into the desired document, the transformation module (414 in Fig 4) can output the edited document as an *intermediate* structured document (*content being an intermediate form*), which can be reloaded for further editing (section 0071). Haung further disclose one embodiment that ultimately converts the metafile to an XML file (section 0050; section 0036). Within the specifications (section 0033), the applicant discloses a XML file as being an intermediate form that takes into consideration the edit form, the content-control statement, and perhaps the layout statement. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to save the output in an intermediate format such as XML during the editing process of dynamically producing a document/page. The motivation for doing so would have been for the advantage of not having to produce/output the document immediately after creating it, as it could easily be reloaded for further editing at a later time.

In regard to dependent claims 7 and 22, these claims contain substantially similar subject matter as in claims 6, and 21, and therefore are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 15 Mar 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments Huang reference does not disclose or even suggest the use of a single edit form from which multiple layouts may be obtained in the manner of the present invention. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the Kutay reference does not disclose or suggest such an arrangement either. Thus, Applicant argues that neither Haung nor Kutay presents an edit form, which is dynamic.

The Examiner disagrees.

Haung teaches a conversion module, in which a modified metafile is input to an integration module along with a style sheet. The integration module generates the XML file from the modified metafile in accordance with the style sheet. Haung further teaches a style sheet is typically configured to include mapping rules in accordance of the media on which the object from the metafile will be presented (0052-0053). Using the broadest interpretation of Haung's teachings, the examiner concludes that if a different layout of the metadata is desired, only the style sheet would need to be modified.

Kutay et al. teaches an interface which allows the user to generate tags, which enables the view to write dynamic data (0148). The view enables dynamic data to be displayed on pages created in a specific language, for example HTML (0076).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176



DOUG HUTTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100